

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500110029-4

it is—and has been—because of past restrictions and exclusions of those of Asian ancestry which caused the family reunification features of this legislation to be less meaningful than they ought to be.

OUTDATED ALLEGATIONS

As a native Californian, Senator KUCHUK, you may well remember the Yellow Peril menace fears that were deliberately fomented and exploited in the pre-World War II West to explain and excuse the racial exclusion of the Japanese, and of the Chinese and other orientals too, from both immigration and naturalization.

While these slurs and slanders have now been thoroughly discredited, nevertheless there may be a useful purpose in reviewing some of the more emphasized ones in the light of the current legislation that proposes to repeal the final racist discriminations against Asians in American immigration law. From time to time, one still hears these outdated allegations repeated.

The most vicious of all canards was that the Japanese especially could not be trusted as loyal Americans in times of national emergency, particularly if their ancestral homeland was involved.

The unprecedented combat record of the Japanese-American GI, who served with outstanding gallantry in both the European and Pacific theaters of World War II, refutes this charge.

While that war record is too well known to require documentation here, it may be well to remind Americans that the 442d Central Postal Directory, composed of Japanese Americans from the continental mainland and Hawaii, many of whom volunteered from so-called relocation camps to which they and their families had been evacuated from their west coast homes and associations, has been described as the most decorated American military unit in history for its size and length of service. And that General MacArthur's Chief of Staff for Intelligence has summed up the contributions of the Japanese-American intelligence troops in the Pacific as having saved millions of American casualties and billions of American dollars.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in inviting Japanese Americans to volunteer for combat duty against the enemies of America early in 1942, declared that "Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart, and not of race or ancestry."

By that yardstick, Japanese Americans are as loyal and dedicated to the cause of the United States as any other group of Americans.

That the Japanese, among other Asians, could not be assimilated into the mainstream of America—because of their Oriental background and heritage—was another major allegation directed against those of Japanese ancestry in the pre-World War II era.

The facts offer clear rebuttal.

Now group of Americans is more law abiding. Japanese Americans spend more time for education, including the college level, than the average American. More are in the professions than the average. More own their own homes, and operate their own business enterprises. The average income, individual and family, as well as urban and rural, are higher than their non-Japanese counterparts. They are more community and civic minded, contributing more on the average to such charities as the Community Chest, Red Cross, etc. At the same time, they remain off of relief rolls and generally refuse other government aid of a relief nature. They bought more war bonds, and buy more Government savings bonds.

By almost any legitimate criterion of exemplary citizenship and Americanism, Japanese Americans are an assimilated, integrated, and accepted part of the communities in which they live and of the Nation to which they owe allegiance.

Today, in California and in every other State in the Union, Japanese Americans in their lives and in their living prove again the miracle of America. Involved in almost every line of human endeavor and activity, in your State and in every State in the Union, they have made significant contributions and will continue to make substantial contributions, to the betterment of the community, State, and Nation.

Personifying the kind of Americans that those of oriental background can be and are, and serving as living refutation of all the stereotypes and sneers once directed against those of Asian origin, are your two distinguished colleagues from Hawaii, Senators FOWLE and ITOYAMA.

Even more noteworthy than perhaps the accomplishments is that they were achieved in spite of special laws and ordinances, and economic and social practices, which were deliberately exploited to make more difficult, and to prevent the assimilation of the Japanese-Americans.

Indeed, according to a special compilation of a Cornell Law School professor, even as late as 1946, there were some 500 Federal, State, and local laws that directly or indirectly restricted and circumscribed the lives and opportunities of those of Japanese ancestry in the United States, citizens as well as aliens. Included were the so-called alien land laws which not only prevented resident alien Japanese from purchasing and owning real property but also restricted the right of their citizen children in these respects; prohibitions against the issuance of licenses to carry on certain businesses, enterprises, and professions; bars to certain employment; housing and rental restrictions, etc.

That orientals can create a community and state that is thoroughly in keeping with American ideals and traditions, and yet not be of the same ethnic and cultural heritage as those who overwhelmingly dominated in the 1920 census is witnessed in Hawaii, where most of the people of our newest State are of nonwhite ancestry.

There is no evidence, then, that the national origins system and the Asia-Pacific triangle discriminations in American immigration law should be retained and continued because of the activities—past, present, and potential—of those of Japanese, Chinese, and other Asian ancestry.

SUMMARY REASONS FOR IMMIGRATION BILL

JACL believes that there are many real and positive justifications for the early enactment of the immigration bill.

Among these reasons are the following:

It would complete the objective of eliminating race as an accepted principle and practice in our immigration law.

It would remove the stigma and insult of inferiority from certain peoples and nations.

It would demonstrate that our concern for the peoples and nations and problems of Asia are equal to our concerns for Europe.

It would bring our practices closer to our precepts of equality and equity.

It would strengthen U.S. leadership in the free world.

It would bring our immigration law into conformity with our civil rights and other such statutes dealing with the internal opportunities of our citizens.

It would help unite families separated by the vicissitudes of the existing immigration law.

It would encourage the professionals, the scientists, the educators, and the specially gifted and skilled to seek entry, thereby aiding our economic growth and enriching our culture.

It would help alleviate labor shortages, without reducing living standards, working conditions, and wages.

It would continue the great American tradition of a haven for the oppressed and the tempest-tossed.

It would bring about a greater and more prosperous Nation.

We regret that this letter is so long and detailed. But we are hopeful that it may be helpful in securing enactment of the immigration bill, H.R. 2580, as amended. We are also hopeful that this will be the last time that we need to urge the Congress to reject racism in our immigration code for humanity, dignity, and the national interest.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

MIKE MARAKA,
Washington Representative
Office of Senator

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators who have been working on rather tentative speeches on the pending measure. A number of those speeches will be speeches in opposition to the bill. Perhaps some of them—I presume some of them—will be speeches in behalf of the bill. Merely in the hope that a Senator may want to make a rather lengthy speech, or even a short speech, on the subject before we close our business for tonight, I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum. It is my hope that we can get on with this legislation. There are several important measures which must be considered—and this is one of them—before the Senate adjourns sine die.

I would hope we could sit until a later hour tomorrow. I take this means of notifying the Senate that we hope to get a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate on the measure tomorrow. If we cannot get it then, perhaps we can make the request the following day.

Mr. President, upon that basis, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to refer again to the discussion here in the Senate yesterday concerning the actions we have taken in the Dominican Republic. Overnight, I have reflected on my statements at that time. As much as I dislike being in disagreement with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I nevertheless continue to believe that the actions of the President were necessary in the national interest of the United States.

We simply cannot stand idly by and run the risk of another Communist takeover in the Western Hemisphere, and we must act promptly when there are clear indications that this may well be taking place. I realize that many will charge me with being "trigger-happy," but I believe that any other course would lead to much worse consequences than the Senator from Arkansas suggested yesterday might result from our intervention in the Dominican Republic.

In my view, it is essential that social revolution, if indeed sufficient progress

cannot be achieved by social evolution, in the Western Hemisphere must not become a tool by which Communist domination is achieved. We all certainly know that there are no "independent" Communist regimes. Any Communist-directed group which gains control of a nation will do the bidding of either Moscow, Peking, or the Castro government at Havana, and such foreign domination is condemned by the unanimous action of all the nations in the Western Hemisphere.

It is a matter of judgment in each individual situation as to the action it is necessary to take and the time to take it. In this particular case, the Senator from Arkansas has reached the conclusion that we should have risked the takeover. Even though I can agree that we might have done more at an earlier stage to use our influence to resist the ascendance of the Communist elements in the rebel forces, I would like again to state that I do not believe President Johnson could have done anything other than use the direct power of the United States as events actually developed.

We had an experience in Louisiana when there was an attempt to overthrow and take over the government. Where that occurs, and there is an attempt to forcibly take over a government, if the legal authorities move soon enough and with overwhelming force, there need be no fight; but if there is a move with only a small amount of force, the government might have a battle on its hands. While we in our State may be criticized by some as being in a "banana republic," we in Louisiana have done business with Central and South America, and we know what the term "banana republic" means. We have traded with Central and South America, and we know that at times certain interests in our State have taken sides in these revolutions as they have occurred.

So I believe we have an understanding of the problems of Central and South America.

In that connection, Mr. President, I do wish to complain about the completely irresponsible handling of the matter by a newspaper for which I have great respect, the Washington Post. That newspaper for the most part tends to report the news by standards that are generally regarded as good ethics. In this particular case the reporting has been bad and the editorializing and writing of the news has been so bad that it has made me wonder whether the reporter, in reporting the debate and writing about the events—which was done by the same reporter, Mr. Goshko—received his training in the schools of the United States or the Soviet Union. Some of those stories have been with regard to this Senator.

It is beyond me to understand the point when someone says we went in with too much force. The safe thing to do is to send a great number of troops, and more than would be needed for a fight, so that Communist elements that might decide to fire on American troops would know they could not defeat the forces of the United States and therefore would not try it. That is the point I made.

All the press reported, as reflected by the articles written by John Goshko of the Washington Post, who chose the Communist philosophy of reporting, was that I talked about my father. He reported that I said "Daddy." I do not believe I said that.

That is all the reporting we got in answer to the statements that we sent in too many troops.

The point is that the best thing is to send in enough troops so that the enemy knows it could not succeed.

The typical Communist-type reporting said only that I made reference to my father. I did so only by way of illustration. When there was a confrontation with what appeared to be a ragtag army to overthrow law and order in that state, they were faced with overwhelming force.

I made reference to people who were organizing and intended to resist the lawful authority of state government.

When the National Guard appeared, the only person who had been hurt was a person who shot himself in attempting to get through a barbed-wire fence. He had shot himself with his own gun. No one else was injured.

When this Nation sent in substantial forces in the Dominican Republic, the Communists or Communist sympathizers, as well as rebel elements, out of caution, in very few instances fired on our troops.

Unfortunately, there were some courageous Americans lost in our effort to preserve freedom and democracy in the Dominican Republic.

Then there were those of the rebel forces who were fired on by our marines and Army troops acting in their own defense and the defense of those that they went there to protect.

I made another point. If it is thought that there is going to be a Communist takeover, the sooner we move and the faster we move, the sooner and easier it will be over.

Our intelligence information was that the Communists were progressively gaining power and control over the rebellion and they were satisfied how difficult it was going to be to keep the Communists from taking charge of the rebellion movement and to keep the Communists from moving in during a situation of chaos; that it was the kind of situation in which Communists take over.

About the only reference I got by this Soviet-type reporter of the Washington Post was that I referred to the Confederacy. Oh, yes; I made an arm-waving speech. I use my hands when I am speaking extemporaneously.

The Post reporter said I referred to the Confederacy. What I said was that a great number of battles are lost, because people move too slowly; or, to use the expression that comes from World War II, "too little and too late." Great Britain suffered much in the early days of the war because her forces came either too late or were not numerous enough to prevail in the battles that occurred.

With regard to the initiative, which is something that is taught in any military exercise, I merely pointed out that there had been occasions when victory

was within the grasp of one side or the other if it had exercised the initiative soon enough. I gave an illustration. In a small way, the junior Senator from Louisiana is a student of the Civil War. If, on the first day of the Battle of Shiloh, Albert Sidney Johnston had not been bleeding to death in the saddle because he declined to relinquish command, and if Gen. P. G. T. Beauregard, a resident of my State, had not found himself in command and for lack of better information called off the attack on the first day, but had waited until the atmosphere had been cleared of smoke, and had renewed the attack on the following day, and if General Beauregard had instead pursued the attack, he would have driven General Grant's army into the river. At least, that is what most military experts think. That would then have been a great southern victory of the magnitude of the Battle of Bull Run; and the North having suffered nothing but major defeats, with one victory by Grant at Fort Donelson, the South would have been encouraged, and the capture of Vicksburg and the many other successes that Grant enjoyed thereafter would probably never have occurred. Grant would probably have been relieved of his command and have been dishonored as a result of having been totally unprepared for the attacks that fell upon him in more hostilities than one. I cited that merely as an example by which people exercise the initiative and prevail, when otherwise they would not.

The Soviet-type reporter for the Washington Post said I spoke about the Confederacy. I gave that as an example to prove that, by moving timely, rather than moving late, one could prevail in what he was seeking to do.

I regret that the Washington Post seems to feel so prejudiced about the matter that it cannot report both sides of the debate. The Post is a responsible newspaper. In the main, I have observed that it has conducted itself according to the highest standards of journalism. I regret very much to see this exception.

There is no doubt in my mind that the President had the information he needed to know that this Nation was in danger. Seeing the nature of the republics that have been taken behind the Iron Curtain, the President, in my judgment, saved this country from allowing one more nation to undergo communism by moving so timely as he did. The fact that he moved so soon and with such complete justification, both to protect American lives and to help restore order and enable the people of the Dominican Republic to elect whatever government those people want in free elections, was, in my judgment, a great contribution to freedom and democracy in this hemisphere.

The people of the Dominican Republic would never have had the right to elect a government of their choosing had the Communist brutality succeeded. The record shows that in every country in which the Communists have prevailed, up to this time, the government has been one which has denied the

people their right to a free election and a free choice of government. This was accomplished by force of arms, through the movement of troops, or else by sabotage and subversion, in which people were murdered. The result was that the people were denied the right to choose their own government.

No one can predict with any certainty what the people of the Dominican Republic will do when they vote on their choice of a government within 9 months; but at least they will have a chance to choose. If the Communists take over the Dominican Republic, they will have to do it by winning an election, not by murder, assassination, and armed revolt; not by denying the people the rights that a free people should enjoy in Cuba and everywhere else in the Western Hemisphere.

RECESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 20, 1965:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1972. (Reappointment.)

U.S. MARSHAL

Emmett E. Shelby, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Florida for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Donald F. Miller, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of Lieutenant:

Frank C. Morgret III	Joseph B. Donaldson
William H. Low, Jr.	Jerald L. Rendall
Earle W. Keith III	Stanley E. Wood, Jr.
Bruce W. Thompson	John L. Bailey
Gregory J. Sanok	Ronald C. Addison
Joseph Marotta	Patrick H. Cannon, Jr.
James C. Carpenter	Frank R. Peasley
Derrill R. Kramer	James K. Woodie
Ruloff W. Whiteman	Edward R. Pusey, Jr.
Kenneth L. Lambertson	Pat Murray
John W. Keith	James R. Shontell
Frederick H. O. Mayr	Richard E. Van Ry
Ralph E. Knorr	Franklin E. Taylor
Jack A. Eckert	Donald C. Addison
Francis W. J. Nicely	James F. Hunt
Hal M. Floyd	Gerald W. Barney
Leeland N. Gregg, Jr.	Frederick S. Bowman
William C. Donnell	Roy L. Foote
Vincent R. Abrahamson	Allen E. Rolland
Donald H. Ramsden	James L. Walker
George R. Grochowski	William L. Avery
Homer A. Purdy	David W. Proudfoot
Richard F. Young	James A. McIntosh
John R. Malloy III	James L. Mueller
Roger D. Williams	Richard J. Kiesel
Roger T. Ostrom	Joseph H. Discenza
Donald F. Kemner	David H. Withers
David I. Tomlinson	Leonard J. Pichini
George H. Martin	William S. Haight
	Frederick D. Smith
	Charles W. Morgan

Robert A. Barker
Richard C. McKean, Jr.

Larry D. Brooks
Francis W. Mooney
Ronald M. Potter
Richard C. Blaschke
Stephen H. Hines
George A. Castmire
Robert K. Blaschke
Thomas P. Keane
Thomas H. Lloyd, Jr.
Thomas W. Boerger
John G. Denninger, Jr.
Arthur R. Gandt
John W. Brittain
Lawrence M. Schilling
David W. Robinette
David H. Whitten
Harvey L. Wahnquist, Jr.
John P. Ryan
Harry A. Allen
Joseph L. Valenti
Lance A. Eagan
Richard B. O'Keefe
Hugh L. Thomas, Jr.
William J. Wallace, Jr.
Eugene Hornstein
John A. Wuestneck
Michael J. Schiro
Harold L. Bonnet
Arthur W. Mergner, Jr.
Elmer Sorensen, Jr.
Frederick A. Kelley
James H. Lightner
Raymond D. Bland
James F. Greene, Jr.
Arthur E. Henn
John T. Mason
Joseph H. Sanford
Joseph J. Smith
Lawrence J. Dallaire, Jr.
Peter C. Hennings
Walter M. Coburn
Henry B. Traver
William H. Spence
Wade M. Moncrief, Jr.
David S. Gemmell
Richard V. Consigli
Carl H. Burkhardt
Joseph P. DiBella
Neal Mahan
George E. Archer, Jr.

John P. Ryan
Harry A. Allen
Joseph L. Valenti
Lance A. Eagan
Richard B. O'Keefe
Hugh L. Thomas, Jr.
William J. Wallace, Jr.
Eugene Hornstein
John A. Wuestneck
Michael J. Schiro
Harold L. Bonnet
Arthur W. Mergner, Jr.
Elmer Sorensen, Jr.
Frederick A. Kelley
James H. Lightner
Raymond D. Bland
James F. Greene, Jr.
Arthur E. Henn
John T. Mason
Joseph H. Sanford
Joseph J. Smith
Lawrence J. Dallaire, Jr.

Peter C. Hennings
Walter M. Coburn
Henry B. Traver
William H. Spence
Wade M. Moncrief, Jr.
David S. Gemmell
Richard V. Consigli
Carl H. Burkhardt
Joseph P. DiBella
Neal Mahan
George E. Archer, Jr.

John P. Ryan
Harry A. Allen
Joseph L. Valenti
Lance A. Eagan
Richard B. O'Keefe
Hugh L. Thomas, Jr.
William J. Wallace, Jr.
Eugene Hornstein
John A. Wuestneck
Michael J. Schiro
Harold L. Bonnet
Arthur W. Mergner, Jr.
Elmer Sorensen, Jr.
Frederick A. Kelley
James H. Lightner
Raymond D. Bland
James F. Greene, Jr.
Arthur E. Henn
John T. Mason
Joseph H. Sanford
Joseph J. Smith
Lawrence J. Dallaire, Jr.

John P. Ryan
Harry A. Allen
Joseph L. Valenti
Lance A. Eagan
Richard B. O'Keefe
Hugh L. Thomas, Jr.
William J. Wallace, Jr.
Eugene Hornstein
John A. Wuestneck
Michael J. Schiro
Harold L. Bonnet
Arthur W. Mergner, Jr.
Elmer Sorensen, Jr.
Frederick A. Kelley
James H. Lightner
Raymond D. Bland
James F. Greene, Jr.
Arthur E. Henn
John T. Mason
Joseph H. Sanford
Joseph J. Smith
Lawrence J. Dallaire, Jr.

Peter C. Hennings
Walter M. Coburn
Henry B. Traver
William H. Spence
Wade M. Moncrief, Jr.
David S. Gemmell
Richard V. Consigli
Carl H. Burkhardt
Joseph P. DiBella
Neal Mahan
George E. Archer, Jr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles W. Abbott	Raymond A. Cameron
James W. Abraham	Richard E. Campbell
James R. Aichele	David I. Carter
Harry L. Alderman	Clement C. Chamberlain, Jr.
Richard D. Alexander	Byron T. Chen
Arthur W. Anthony, Jr.	Gregory J. Clizek
Peter F. C. Armstrong	Harold C. Colvin
Maurice C. Ashley, Jr.	Jack W. Conard
Freddie J. Baker	Andrew B. Cook
James M. Bannan	Charles G. Cooper
William D. Bassett, Jr.	William R. Corson
Arnold E. Bench	Franklin G. Cowie, Jr.
Lee R. Bendell	Harry O. Cowing, Jr.
Garland T. Beyerle	William E. Cross, Jr.
Darrel E. Bjorklund	Philip M. Crosswait
Louis A. Bonin	George D. Cumming
Eugene R. Brady	Bruce F. Cunliffe
Robert B. Brennan	Ralph L. Cunningham, Jr.
Edward J. Bronars	John K. Davis
Robert G. Brown	Thomas J. Deen, Jr.
Travis D. Brown	Claude E. Deering, Jr.
Clement C. Buckley, Jr.	Francis L. Delaney
Thomas J. Burckell	Lewis H. Devine
Donald J. Burger	Birchard B. De Witt
Conrad P. Buschmann	Lawrence R. Dorsa
Kenneth M. Buas	Joshua W. Dorsey, III
John E. Buynak	Edward J. Driscoll, Jr.

James W. Duncan	James P. Meyers, Jr.
Cecil C. Dunningan	John B. Michaud
Carl J. Emma	Richard D. Mickelson
Clyde L. Ever	Donald C. Miller
Gilbert W. Ferguson	John H. Miller
William B. Fleming	Robert R. Montgomery
Kenneth S. Foley	Anthony A. Monti
Eugene D. Foxworth, Jr.	Ira L. Morgan, Jr.
Richard H. Francis	Rodney B. Moss
Walter A. Gagne, Jr.	Ross L. Mulford
Joseph J. N. Gamberdella	Joseph Nastasi
Jesse L. Gibney, Jr.	Robert C. Needham
Robert N. Good	Harry J. Nolan
Carlton D. Goodiel, Jr.	Victor Ohanesian
Fred Grabowski	Robert W. Oliver
Fredric A. Green	James B. Omara
John R. Greenstone	Charles H. Opfar, Jr.
John E. Greenwood	Thomas A. Palmer
William R. Grubaugh	William K. Parcell
Robert E. Gruenier	Tom D. Parsons
Edward M. Guell	Roger W. Peard, Jr.
Thomas I. Gunning	Edward F. Penloe
Frederick M. Haden	Arthur R. Petersen
John W. Haggerty, III	George R. Phillips
Lawrence A. Hall	Reagan L. Pels
Wayne L. Hall	Vincent J. Pross, Jr.
Andrew E. Hare	Heman J. Redfield, III
Elwin B. Hart	Pierre D. Relasner, Jr.
Harold A. Hatch	Clarke A. Rhykerd
George A. P. Haynes	David M. Ridderhof
George E. Hayward	Edward J. Rigby
Keith H. Helms	Thomas E. Ringwood
Hans W. Henzel	Dwight E. Roberts
Stanley A. Herman	Kenneth L. Robinson, Jr.
William M. Herrin, Jr.	William K. Rockey
Charles O. Hiett	Charles A. Rosenfield
Henry Hoppe III	Earl F. Roth, Jr.
William W. Horn	Edward J. Rutty
George W. Houck	Victor A. Ruvo
Dwight E. Howard	Raymond M. Ryan
Robert E. Howard, Jr.	Joseph L. Sadowski
David J. Hunter	George T. Sargent, Jr.
Robert E. Hunter	William P. Saunders, Jr.
David J. Hytrek	Cornelius F. Savage, Jr.
Edgar K. Jacks	John P. Schied
Mallett C. Jackson, Jr.	Baxter W. Seaton
Charles V. Jarman	Ronald I. Severson
John M. Johnson, Jr.	Charles A. Sewell
Warren R. Johnson	Ural W. Shadrick
Charles M. C. Jones, Jr.	Richard W. Sheppe
Richard E. Jones	Warren C. Sherman
Nick J. Kapetan	George H. Shutt, Jr.
William C. Keith, Jr.	Emmett B. Sigmon, Jr.
Don L. Keller	Warren J. Skvaril
Paul X. Kelley	Albert C. Smith, Jr.
Calhoun J. Killen	Edward E. Smith
Grover C. Koonts	Erin D. Smith
George R. Lamb	George W. Smith
Joseph M. Laney, Jr.	Richard J. Smith
James W. Laseter	Thomas G. Snipes
Randlett T. Lawrence	William F. Sparks
Frederick D. Leder	Eugene O. Speckart
Harris J. Levert, Jr.	Newell D. Staley, Jr.
Alan M. Lindell	Donald C. Stanton
Carl R. Lundquist	Marvin H. Stevens
Dean C. Macho	Harold E. Stine
James H. MacLean	Donald R. Stiver
Byron L. Magness	John H. Stroppe
Robert B. March	Otto I. Svenson, Jr.
Donald E. Marchette	Oral R. Swigart, Jr.
James W. Marsh	Leonard C. Taft
James G. Martz, III	Aubrey W. Talbert, Jr.
Jerry F. Mathis	Richard B. Talbott
Frank D. McCarthy	Robert W. Taylor
Bain McClintock	Jay J. Thomas, Jr.
Daniel F. McConnell	Francis H. Thurston
William G. McCool	Donald K. Tooker
Norman B. McCrary	Marshall J. Treado
Robert L. McElroy	Rodolfo L. Trevino
James R. McEnaney	Luther G. Troen
Donald N. McKeon	George F. Tubley
Joseph V. McLernan	Kenneth E. Turner
Paul G. McMahon	David M. Twomey
Alexander P. McMillan	Wendell N. Vest
Russell W. McNutt	Hal W. Vincent
Edward J. Megarr	Michael J. Vrabel
David G. Mehargue	

September 20, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5313

some part of the electorate contrary to the Constitution of the United States, then our body has not acted fully and completely by making a report and a recommendation for dismissal based solely on technical grounds after a 3-hour executive session by the Committee on House Administration which had considered the notices of contest.

The people of Mississippi, even those who are alleged to have acted improperly—yes, the people of the entire country deserve to have their day in court—the court of representative government, in this case, the House of Representatives of the United States. Only a full and complete public hearing before the appropriate committee of the Congress would satisfy those who deplore disenfranchisement and cry for justice.

So, as a judge, I would say, "Demurrer overruled." Let us try the case on its merits and bring out all the facts even though the probable end result will be dismissal. If the evil of disenfranchisement is ever to be eradicated from the American scene, the need is to dramatize the facts so that all persons will know that some American citizens were denied their constitutional rights.

For these reasons, I support recommitment and, if this fails, I shall vote against the resolution, as amended, particularly since the amendment strikes from the resolution that the five Congressmen were "entitled to their seats." This just makes the resolution more technical and would make final action, if the resolution were adopted, nothing more than a refusal to meet the issue at this time.

If, perchance, these remarks fall into the hands of some of my constituents who find me a bit legalistic—somewhat judicial—may I remind them that today was the first time my duties required me to sit as judge and jury.

The Retirement of Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert is retiring this month as Secretary of the Air Force, and I want to take this opportunity to comment, both as a Member of Congress and as a chairman of a subcommittee which has worked closely with Mr. Zuckert, on his activities the past 4½ years.

During the past 10 years investigating availability of government information, the subcommittee which I head has looked into dozens of information problems involving the Air Force. In recent years the Air Force has adopted many improvements in its information practices, and I believe Secretary Zuckert deserves a large measure of the credit for these improvements.

Air Force officials under Mr. Zuckert's

direction have been readily accessible to the subcommittee and its staff. They have given the most careful consideration to the recommendations which the House Government Operations Committee has adopted as a result of the subcommittee's investigations. And they have made extensive efforts to put these recommendations into effect. Mr. Zuckert is to be commended for the cooperative atmosphere created under his administration.

There are two major Air Force installations in my congressional district and, as a Member of Congress, I have experienced all of the problems which can be expected from extensive Federal activities in a local community. I have found the Air Force officials under Secretary Zuckert most receptive to suggestions from the community and most interested in putting into practice the principles of good management for which Mr. Zuckert stands.

A Socially Isolated Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, several months ago a small Michigan community gained the attention of the national press due to the Economic Opportunity Act. A dispute arose about whether or not the community—Ypsilanti, Mich.—was in a sufficient state of poverty to qualify for assistance under the poverty program. Those who favored a community action program for Ypsilanti described the community as being "socially isolated." Opponents of the program protested that a community that was a 10-minute automobile ride from the University of Michigan and less than a half hour from Detroit is hardly socially isolated.

An article in the New York Times on September 16 should satisfy the proponents of the poverty program that Ypsilanti will no longer be "socially isolated." The article described plans being made to build a \$2.5 million Ypsilanti Greek Theater. Scheduled to open in July 1966, the amphitheater will seat 1,900 people. How could a socially isolated community like Ypsilanti expect to utilize such a cultural center? The answer was provided by Mrs. Clara Owens the president of the theater group's board of directors:

She said the Michigan city was "a good place" for such venture because it was "in the center of a tremendous population—about 5 million." "We are 10 minutes from Ann Arbor, 30 minutes from Detroit, 45 minutes from Toledo and about 1 hour from Lansing," she continued. "Moreover, we have more than three-quarters of a million high school and college students within a radius of 60 miles."

Mr. Speaker, I insert the entire article describing the Ypsilanti Greek Theater in the RECORD at this point:

YPSILANTI PLANS A GREEK THEATER—\$2.5 MILLION PROJECT IS SET—ALEXIS SOLOMOS TO DIRECT

(By Louis Calta)

If Alexis Solomos has his way—and he is confident that he will—ancient Greek drama will come alive from American audiences next summer in Ypsilanti, Mich.

The 47-year-old former director of the Greek National Theater, pausing briefly here yesterday after his arrival on the *Queen Elizabeth*, said he hoped to "present Greek tragedy not as something out of a museum but as something live." "I hope it will get into the blood of the American theatergoing public," he added.

Mr. Solomos, who was accompanied by his wife, Katherine, and two daughters, has been engaged as artistic director of the Ypsilanti Greek Theater, which plans to present Greek drama and comedies in English in a \$2.5 million, 1,900-seat amphitheater.

The theater will be built on a city-owned site adjacent to the Huron River. It will be enclosed, heated, and air conditioned. Harry Weese, architect for the Washington Arena Stage and the Orlando (Fla.) Theater, has designed it along "classic Greek lines." Work on the venture is expected to start in October. The opening is scheduled for next July.

PATTERSON AND ELDER TO HELP

Tom Patterson, founder of the Stratford (Ontario) Shakespeare Festival, will be executive director of the new theater but will continue as planning consultant for Canada's first permanent Shakespearean theater. Eldon Elder, Broadway scenic designer, will act as theater consultant to Mr. Weese.

Mr. Solomos, who has staged several off-Broadway productions, said that he was "very excited" about returning to the United States. He held high hopes for the Michigan theater season, which is to become an annual event.

He explained that students from Eastern Michigan University would participate as apprentice performers and technicians, but that the bulk of the acting company would be professional. Students will take part in the productions as part of their drama courses.

"We hope to make it not just another summer festival but an international center of Greek drama," he said. "Ancient Greek drama can be compared to a Hitchcock movie if properly done. For example, look at the popularity of 'Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?' It brings out the various inner truths in a savage manner just as the ancients did."

Mr. Solomos said that until 15 years ago ancient drama was unknown to the general public even in Greece.

"But when we started working on them we realized how much uneducated people got a kick out of them. The wisdom, poetry, and human experience in Greek theater is something the American public can understand."

The director had come to the United States because he was "bored with doing the same thing every year in Greece." He said he planned to remain in Michigan for 1 or 2 years.

The Ypsilanti Greek Theater is the brain child of Mrs. Clara Owens, a 58-year-old high school teacher of English, who is president of the theater group's board of directors.

Mrs. Owens said yesterday that the idea for a classic theater in Ypsilanti occurred to her 2 years ago. "I decided it was high time we had a restoration of Greek culture and drama in the United States."

She said the Michigan city was "a good place" for such a venture because it was "in the center of a tremendous population—about 5 million." "We are 10 minutes from Ann Arbor, 30 minutes from Detroit, 45 minutes from Toledo, and about 1 hour from Lansing," she continued. "Moreover, we

A5314

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 20, 1965

have more than three-quarters of a million high school and college students within a radius of 60 miles."

About \$200,000 has already been donated to the project Mrs. Owens said, and she expressed confidence that the total amount needed will be raised. Spyros Skouras has agreed to serve on the group's board of directors, as has Joe Nederlander, theater owner. Judith Anderson and Melina Mercouri have offered to appear at the theater.

DR

I Never Will Order Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a translation of the letter written by Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin of the Dominican Republic on September 10, 1965, after his expulsion from his country, to Dr. Hector Garcia Godoy, provisional president of the Dominican Republic. This letter was translated by Jules Dubois, the Chicago Tribune's Latin American correspondent, and was carried in a recent issue of the Tribune.

The American people are deeply concerned about events in the Dominican Republic. I have contacted the Department of State for their report on the ouster of General Wessin y Wessin in an attempt to help clarify and untangle the numerous conflicting reports on this matter.

The general's letter follows:

A few hours after having arrived in this city of Miami, I am writing this letter to you in order to make clear in precise and definitive form my position regarding the recent events in which I have been involved.

The Dominican people are conscious that, thanks to my loyalty during the grave events that began April 24, our country in these moments is not totally dominated by communism.

An elemental sense of honor as an army officer prevents me from accepting the post of consul general in Miami from a government that has used foreign troops to send me by force into exile. I communicated this to Generals Alvim and Palmer when they told me I was consul in Miami.

The afternoon when Generals Alvim and Palmer told me that I had to go and a lieutenant of the American Army prevented me from going to my house to collect my clothes and my passport, I had a firm conviction not to serve your government, neither in the consulate of Miami nor in any other post.

Never would I have imagined that an army officer of my rank would have been taken to the airport in full uniform and tossed out of the country with a bayonet at his back.

(NOTE.—By this General Wessin does not mean that he was literally prodded by a bayonet, but that troops with guns and fixed bayonets formed the security guard that accompanied him.)

The North American officials who ordered my exit from Dominican territory in such a humiliating manner have given the coup de grace to the fight for democracy in America. Imagine the impact that this action by the OAS and the Government of the United

States will have on the Latin American military men.

Do you believe that the Latin American military men will be disposed to fight communism when they know that the payment for fulfillment of their duty will be expulsion from their country and the loss of their military career?

When the North American troops arrived in the Dominican Republic—after the men under my command had received the brunt of the attack from a Communist mob drunk with vengeance and death—I never imagined that the same troops, making common cause with the enemies of democracy, would kick me out of my country in a manner so harsh for those who say that they are the leaders in the fight for survival of the western world.

I have arrived in Miami without passport, without money, and with a suit that the officers of Fort Amador gave me in Panama, but I preserve my dignity and my name. The men who fight for an idea cannot be destroyed, and, although they may be (destroyed) physically, that idea would remain unchanged.

I have always been an honest officer and that the North American intelligence services know, for they have scoured all the banks of the world seeking some evidence with which to stain my reputation.

In these moments I have had to dismantle my home, to sell my furniture and my house, and to separate myself from my family. I only possess (in order to maintain that home, which I will have to organize anew in exile) the pension to which I have a right after 21 years of service in the armed forces of my country.

My departure from the country augurs grave events for the cause of democracy. What Dominican military man who has self-respect will be disposed to assume responsibilities when communism launches its final attack against our fatherland?

Presently the world fights for its survival against the Communist lash and it is necessary for men of profound convictions to assume the defense of democracy. Those men cannot be destroyed in order to satisfy political ambitions or in order to appease communism without leading us to total destruction.

The departure from my country will be a shameful page for the political history of the Dominican Republic and for the rulers who, like you, are responsible for it. No Dominican can remain insensible before such a monstrous act, and the day will come when the truth will open a path against betrayal and deceit.

I reiterate to you that I cannot accept the appointment of consul general in Miami because it would be to put myself at the service of a government that has betrayed Dominican democracy and would constitute disloyalty to the brave soldiers and officers who accompanied me in those tragic days in which blood spilled over the soil of our fatherland.

To those soldiers and officers of the armed forces, I cannot betray you, because it would be an act of cowardice. To the Dominican people: I cannot abandon you, because it would be to abjure the ideals of Duarte, Sanchez, and Mella. To American democracy: I cannot turn my back on you, because it would be to open the doors to communism in order to administer the death blow to our system of life.

We are going to say the same thing as Gen. Juan Sanchez Ramirez in the battle of Palo Hincado, when he defeated the troops of Emperor Napoleon:

"Death to the soldier who turns his face around. Death to the drummer who beats retreat. Death to the officer who so orders, ever, if it were myself."

And I, Mr. President, never will order retreat. My brave soldiers and officers, my dear Dominican people, my sacred fatherland

will always find me on the line of duty against the traitors who try to deliver us to an ideology that represents an enslaving and brutal system.

I hope that the North American Government does not commit new errors and understands that the best system to contain the advance of communism is not by sacrificing democratic officers. I am confident that the United States can break up that net of infiltrators who conspire against liberty from their own territory and on many occasions from the very offices that handle international affairs.

In publicly criticizing the action against me, it is not my purpose to furnish ammunition to communism in order to attack the United States. I want it made clear that I repudiate the action of those bad North Americans who are causing the prestige of that great nation to be lost, and I am confident that soon there will be a healthy rectification with regard to the mistaken policy that has been followed in my country.

Remember, Mr. President, that committing injustices against the military and the democratic people of our fatherland will make it difficult for you to face the Communist conspiracy. If you should do that, you would have to maintain the presence of foreign troops in our country permanently, and that would be the equivalent definitely to deliver our sovereignty.

ELIAS WESSIN Y WESSIN.

Washington's Bad Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week a series of events unfolded in the Dominican Republic that will ultimately be understood by all objective observers as a low mark in U.S. diplomatic activity and a substantial defeat for peace and freedom to which the American public is dedicated.

As the complete foreign policy collapse of the Johnson administration becomes more evident, the objective newspapers of our country are performing a great public service in honestly reporting to the citizens on matters of truth in present foreign affairs. A notable editorial of this nature appeared in this morning's Chicago Tribune, which I place in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Sept. 20, 1965]

WASHINGTON'S BAD FAITH

The enforced exile of Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin has handed the Communists a quadruple victory in the Dominican Republic. The gunboat diplomacy employed by the United States in the Caribbean in the twenties and early thirties has now been replaced by the airborne diplomacy of the sixties. And its use to whisk Wessin out of the country on the night of September 9 will long be remembered by anti-Communist Dominicans, for there is no record that any Communist has been forcibly ejected or will be booted out by the OAS or the United States from that troubled Caribbean land.

The Communists not only pressured provisional President Hector Garcia-Godoy to retire Wessin from the army but they compelled him—because of the reluctance of the

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23539

According to these plans, the Canadian plant will be equipped almost entirely with new machinery. Very little existing equipment will be moved from either Detroit or Lackawanna to the Canadian location, which will be at Chatham, Ontario. Without ruling out the possibility of reactivation of a portion of the facilities at either Detroit or Lackawanna to meet market demands not now foreseen, the leaf springs to be produced by the Spring Division will be made entirely at the Chatham plant beginning approximately 1 year from now.

Under current conditions the suspension coil spring business remaining is not substantial enough to justify the large plant facilities which they will occupy. In order to warrant the continuation of coil spring manufacture at our present location, it will be necessary for us to obtain a most substantial increase in our volume of business where these items are concerned. This can be done in two ways—by the introduction of new products and by increased market penetration for existing products.

Where new products are concerned we have a most encouraging one in the Torsionetic Universal Joint, but a great deal of time and effort must be expended before this item will replace any substantial portion of the loss where leaf springs are concerned. At best then the Torsionetic Joint represents for the present no more than a good start in the right direction.

Increased market penetration for existing products, the second growth path open to us, is a rugged road to follow, but take it we must for only by it will we reach our common goal of jobs and job security. However, we will succeed in reaching this goal only to the extent that we can sell our springs profitably for less money than our customers are paying us currently. This is an obvious and simple statement of economic fact, but the consequences will hit hard on every facet of our operations.

In the past we have been competing largely with firms like ourselves having leaf springs as their principal product. In the future we will be competing than that to which we have been accustomed. To compete successfully under the new conditions which confront us will require us to examine every single phase of our operations and to make whatever adjustments are required to assure that we operate with a maximum of efficiency and that we avoid all needless expense during the critical days which lie ahead.

In closing, I would emphasize that management has no intention of abandoning the manufacture of coil springs and that it has high hopes that these phases of our current operations can be carried on successfully provided only that every member of the organization accepts his share of the job which confronts us.

Sincerely yours,

H. H. CLARK,
General Manager.

DETROIT, MICH.,
September 16, 1965.

The Honorable ALBERT GORE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our heartiest congratulations to you on your forthright and perceptive opposition to the Canadian-United States auto tariff agreement now under Senate consideration.

Our members have already been informed that the entire leaf spring operation in the spring division of Eaton Manufacturing Co. will cease at the end of the 1966 model year because this product will be manufactured exclusively in a new Eaton Canadian facility thereafter.

This means that 350 of our members will have their jobs completely eliminated because of the private assurances to Canada of a substantial business increase.

No doubt many more United States firms, such as Eaton Manufacturing Co., will be transferring their operations to Canada to avail themselves of the competitive advantages these assurances provide. Consequently many more U.S. workers will be losing their jobs once the agreement becomes fully effective.

We respectfully request that you continue your noble endeavor to achieve Senate rejection of this trade-restricting agreement with the wholehearted support of every member of this local union.

Sincerely,

LOCAL 368, U.A.W., AFL-CIO,
WARREN MIKA, President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, although administration witnesses appearing before the committee denied that they knew of any small businessman who has thus far been hurt, or of any who had been intimidated, and thus fearful of opposing this deal for the benefit of the big four, this is also already apparent. I have received a letter from a small businessman in Garden City, Mich., who tells me that he was put out of business after writing a letter to the editor of his newspaper about this agreement. I do not wish to use his name, but I have it in my files if any Senators are interested.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter I now refer to be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Honorable Senator ALBERT GORE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am one of the independent parts makers who carried the Canadian car tariff fight to the public letter box of our local newspapers.

On July 5, 1965, the Detroit Free Press printed the enclosed letter over my signature.

On July 7, 1965, three small parts shipments were returned to me for correction and July 21, 1965, all of my orders were cancelled for "late delivery."

The cancelled orders were assigned to others for more money and the customer tried to charge the penalty to my accounts receivable which still are unpaid. Peak employment was 12 and today none.

Coincidence, perhaps. But you have my best wishes in your fight to protect American industry from unfair competition.

Sincerely,

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reaction on the Canadian side of the border has been equally interesting. Up there, it would appear that consumers have been paying high prices for automobiles—higher than necessary, in my judgment—because of Canadian tariffs. Now, they are going to have to pay higher prices because there will be no tariff. Some of them seem to be having difficulty in understanding any explanation other than that the big four automobile companies will pocket unjustified millions of their dollars.

Indeed, that is what the big four have already done. In pursuance of this agreement, Canada has already unilaterally, if temporarily, eliminated her tariff. The Canadian tariff on new automobiles from the United States is 17 percent. On an Impala Chevrolet or a good Ford or Plymouth, this amounts to \$500 or more on the automobile. This tariff reduction has been in effect since January, I believe, but there have been no reductions in automobile prices to the automobile consumers in Canada. So the big four are already pocketing vast benefits from this agreement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, since this is the morning hour I shall most respectfully, if there are to be speeches, have to object, because I have matters of pressing importance to attend to and desire to obtain the floor myself.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GORE. I shall conclude in 2 minutes. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I commend the able senior Senator from Tennessee for the work he has done in this field. The manipulation of the parts tariff has resulted in a number of manufacturers in this country having a 19 percent negative tariff position, as against those who manufacture parts in Canada. In an effort to correct this situation, an arrangement has now been made which, in my opinion, justifies the apprehension of the Senator from Tennessee because of the considerably lower hourly wage rate paid by leading manufacturers of the United States in their Canadian plants. In my opinion, this development can only result in heavy additional unemployment in the United States. Again, I congratulate the Senator for the fine work he has done in this field.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri. The very purpose of this agreement, the stated purpose of the agreement, is to increase manufacturing facilities in the automotive industry in Canada. I shall have more to say about this later.

I have much sympathy with the point of view of Canadian consumers, and feel that it has great validity. This matter, of course, also has serious foreign policy implications, for these companies are clearly identified by the average Canadian as U.S. companies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters I have received from Canadian citizens be printed at this point in my remarks. One of these is a letter written to a Canadian editor. Because he is associated with one of the big four, his name is not included, but I have it in my files.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

23540

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, CANADA,
September 15, 1965.

Senator ALBERT GORE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read of your recent stand on the Canada-United States auto trade pact and greatly admire you for your stand on same.

There is no sound reason that we Canadians—in my case I am 60 miles from the border—and there is from \$800 to \$1,200 difference in price of a new car.

If they want free trade, throw open the border and let the price of autos reach their own level.

I never have been able to see why we Canadians, with lower pay, are forced to pay larger prices to Canadian companies that are owned by U.S. parent companies.

Go after them sir: good luck.

Yours truly,

T. W. WADE.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA,
May 14, 1965.

The EDITOR,
Winnipeg Free Press,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

DEAR SIR: In your issue of May 11, you report the Honorable Mr. Drury as stating that in spite of the \$50 million yearly reduction or waiver of duty on parts for the car manufacturers, reducing their costs accordingly, this reduction could not be passed on to the public by way of lower prices on cars. The reason he gave was that it was because of the "greater costs of distribution in Canada, stretching as it does from coast to coast, and with many thinly populated areas." Well, the United States stretches from coast to coast, and has many thinly populated areas, and has to meet very similar costs of distribution—which it manages to do, and still keeps the price of its cars hundreds of dollars lower than ours. So this hardly seems to be a valid reason that Mr. Drury has given to us.

To be precise on this matter of costs of distribution in Canada, whether lower or higher or the same as in the United States, such costs are included by the manufacturer in the price at which it sells to its dealers. These costs are integrated and included in factory pricing along with the other elements of cost such as labor, material, supplies, wages, salaries, depreciation, advertising and so forth. Therefore, if the factories reduce the price of cars by the \$50 million in question and retained their present methods of costing, their costs of distribution would be covered as always in the price charged to their dealers. So these costs are hardly a factor that prevents factories from passing along to their dealers, and thus to the consumer the benefit of the \$50 million bonus they have been given by the Government.

But no. The reduction to the consumer cannot be allowed it is said. (Who says? the Government? the factories?)

Instead, this \$50 million (not paid by the factories) plus factory markup on this imaginary \$50 million, and then plus the dealers' markup on this already marked up \$50 million, are all still to be charged to the consumer. For example:

	[In millions]
There is this imaginary nonpaid cost item.....	\$50
To which factory adds its markup, say 20 percent.....	10
Resulting in extra cost to the dealer of...	60
And then the dealer (who has actually paid the \$60 million, it isn't imaginary to him) adds his markup, say 20 percent.....	12
And now we have this extra cost to the consumer.....	72

The public has to pay \$72 million to make good a gift of \$50 million to the factories. Good economics? Commonsense? Equitable?

And the above applies to 1 year only. The word is that it may take 3 years or more to reach the goal. (What is the goal? Price parity with the United States? Near price parity? or what? It has never been spelled out.)

Well then, over a 3-year period, we would have 3 times \$72 million equals \$216 million. Repeat it—\$216 million extra consumer cost.

That is not all. Once the cars with these extra costs get into dealers inventories, the dealers will have to pay the extra insurance premiums and the extra interest on the money borrowed for this \$60 million of fictitious cost, and the consumer in turn will have to pay the extra insurance premiums and the extra interest on money borrowed for the \$72 million of fictitious cost in his retail price. Think of it. Insuring and borrowing money to cover these extra millions that aren't really there.

It may be a good deal for someone, but not for the consumer, helpless against this gouging.

Who, eventually, gets these hundreds of millions of dollars? Presumably any benefits will be concentrated more or less in the principal car manufacturing area of Canada—in the form of increased investment in land, plant, machinery and equipment, and in the form of local increased employment and the increased wages and salaries flowing therefrom. These are all designed to increase production and, hopefully, to lower prices.

How are the other Provinces and their citizens going to feel about this? They are being called upon to foot the bill for the great part of this \$216 million, and about their only tangible return being a promised, sometime, unknown amount of, maybe, car price reduction.

It is ironic. Original imposition of duties and tariffs was to foster Canadian automobile production—being paid for by the consumer in higher prices for his cars and trucks. And now, when tariffs or customs are being eliminated or suspended, the consumer has to pay extra for this too. Tariff up, or tariff down, the consumer pays. These tariffs and duties have helped one area of Canada greatly, and the rest of Canada but slightly. And, in reverse, when tariffs come down, it will be to benefit one area greatly, and the rest of Canada but slightly.

Does anyone know what guarantees of price parity we are getting for this \$216 million or more? Apparently none, since all that we have been told is that over the next few years the factories have promised to try to increase volume and to reduce prices.

A former and famous U.S. Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles Wilson (who had been president of General Motors Corp.), was once quoted as saying that "what was good for General Motors is good for the United States." Likewise it appears that what is good for car makers is good for Canada.

The factories are run by huge, wealthy, and powerful corporations. General Motors, for example, is probably the largest and richest business organization in the world. To say that it needs a share of \$50 million annually for the next few years to enable it to increase production is hard to believe. Neither General Motors or the other corporations are short of the necessary cash, or cash resources or managerial ability needed to produce increased production. In fact, General Motors, for one, manufactures money and profits about as fast as it manufactures cars.

The automobile industry does not need to be financed or subsidized. It may need to be tided.

We don't want an agreement—terms set by

the factories apparently, as to what they may try to do.

Perhaps a directive—governmental—is called for—car and truck prices are to be reduced over the next few years, or else.

Yours truly,

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance is continuing its study of the ramifications of this most unusual agreement. I hope every Senator will become informed on this subject by the time the Senate proceeds to debate the bill which would implement it.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last Friday, September 17, beginning at page 23365 of the RECORD, I undertook to defend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for a speech he made earlier in the week in connection with American foreign policy in the Dominican Republic. The debate has now been joined by two of our well-known, able, and usually accurate and well-informed columnists, Messrs. Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, in an article entitled "Fulbright Furor" published in the Washington Post this morning. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the column be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to make five specific points with respect to the Evans-Novak column.

First, there is ample documentation of Senator FULBRIGHT's reference to the adverse Latin American reaction to U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic. For example, President Raul Leoni, of Venezuela, said:

Such actions * * * tend to revive the era of unilateral intervention, which one supposed had been left far behind by the evolution of international life. They place in serious jeopardy the principles and essential norms that constitute the legal basis of the OAS.

That statement is a quotation from an article in the quarterly "Foreign Affairs," for July 1965.

Similar comments were made by Dr. Rafael Caldera, leader of the COPEI Party in Venezuela; President Fernando Belaunde Terry, of Peru, in his interview on the NBC-TV "white paper"; President Eduardo Frei Montalva, of Chile; and President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, of Mexico. The division of opinion within Argentina was so deep that the Argentine Government faced a domestic political crisis.

There were, of course, Latin Americans who supported the administration's position. But with few exceptions—our action attracted the dictators of Nicaragua, Haiti, and Paraguay, and alienated the democrats of Mexico, Venezuela, and Chile.

My second point is that anti-Americanism in the Dominican Republic, which unquestionably exists to a substantial extent, did not come from the Fulbright speech. It came from the American actions in the Dominican Republic in April and May. By indicating that

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23541

there is a body of senatorial opinion which is opposed to the actions, the Fulbright speech is more likely to encourage antimilitary and democratic Dominicans who would like to view the United States as a liberal nation and a friend. This applies also elsewhere in the hemisphere, as is borne out by the reactions we are daily getting from that area.

My third point concerns the Evans and Novak reference to White House security clearance of a censored report on the full extent on the Communist influence at the time of the April revolt as justifying the action we took to support the military junta in Santo Domingo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to see that report. The Committee on Foreign Relations was given a whole sheaf of classified information on alleged Communist domination of the Dominican revolt.

All I can say is that it was completely unconvincing as to any control of the revolution by Communists except that it indicated that after, but not before, the massive American intervention, a number of Communists did raise their heads and take an active part in the revolution.

My fourth point is that Evans and Novak refer to the so-called quickie probe by the Committee on Foreign Relations. We had 13 sessions, listened to 7 witnesses, all representing the administration, took 660 pages of testimony, and consumed 16½ hours of the committee time. I do not consider that to be a "quickie" investigation. It was searching and far-reaching.

Finally, Mr. President, Evans and Novak complain at some length about the timing of the speech. Granted, there is never a good time for the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to criticize an administration of his own party. However, the speech was withheld until the government of President Garcia Godoy was installed and got off the ground.

In my opinion, the timing of the speech was not only excellent, but it will also, in the long run, do our posture in the Latin American countries a great amount of good.

EXHIBIT 1

THE FULBRIGHT FUROR

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

One month ago, when the Johnson administration was playing midwife in the birth of a new government in Santo Domingo, Senator Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, temporarily laid aside his scathing indictment of U.S. intervention in the bloody Dominican revolution.

Fulbright's reason for delay: With the new government of U.S.-backed Hector Garcia Godoy barely coming into its own, the highly critical analysis of U.S. actions during the late April uprising might set back the

whole affair. Fulbright, chairman of the once-prestigious Senate Foreign Relations Committee, decided to postpone his condemnation of U.S. policy.

But when it came last week, the Fulbright speech was just as ill timed as it would have been a month earlier.

This was President Johnson's appraisal. When he received a copy of the speech 24 hours before its delivery in the Senate, he scanned it briefly.

His immediate complaint: Fulbright's one-sided view of U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic last April would receive far more attention than it deserved (because he is Foreign Relations Committee chairman) and embarrass the future course of U.S. diplomacy in the Dominican Republic.

But in fact, remarked the President to a Senator, the Fulbright critique did not represent even a simple majority of the 19-member committee.

This raises a serious issue: In critical matters of foreign policy, how candid should a Senator of Fulbright's prestige be in attacking and undermining the Government's policy in such a dangerous confrontation?

Until recently, a major controversy such as the one over U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic would have come before Fulbright's committee for a long, reasoned investigation (far more thorough than the quickie probe by the Fulbright committee this summer). This, in times past, would have resulted in a committee report backed by a strong majority. But today, Fulbright's 19-man committee is split into almost 19 parts, representing every shade of opinion.

As the committee has gradually increased in size to accommodate ambitious Senators (from 13 members in 1947 to 19 members to day), its ability to act in unison has declined drastically.

Furthermore, Fulbright is a uniquely original thinker, the antithesis of the organization man or Senate type. Under his chairmanship, the committee has succumbed to factional bickering so severe that Fulbright threatened at one point to refuse to handle the foreign aid bill.

As a result, it is now every man for himself on the committee. But Chairman Fulbright, as the embodiment of the Senate's unique constitutional powers in foreign affairs, still has a special responsibility to consider the results of what he says and its impact outside the United States.

In the Dominican Republic, the impact of Fulbright's speech (described by Senator Thomas E. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, as "a sweeping condemnation" of U.S. policy) is predictable. With all Dominican politicians pointing to the next presidential election there, the Fulbright indictment is certain to lift the chances of the most anti-Yankee candidate in the field.

By dramatizing so harshly his own disillusion with the U.S. decision to intervene, the Senator gives the most extreme anti-U.S. political factions in the Dominican Republic a readymade presidential campaign text. The condemnation of Washington that will soon be ringing from the hustings in Santo Domingo will be flavored with the Senator's own ringing condemnation.

Nobody questions Fulbright's unlimited right to condemn U.S. policy. What critics in the administration—and the Senate as well—question is his timing.

Finally, these critics challenged the Senator's disregard of the sudden chaos last April in Santo Domingo and the impressive evidence of deep Communist penetration of the rebel command.

When Dodd made his reply on Thursday, the White House was concerned enough to give security clearance to a censored report on the full extent of Communist influence in the April revolt. The report alone is a compelling argument for the intervention.

But in the Dominican Republic, Fulbright's attack will be remembered long after the intelligence report is forgotten.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

REFERENCE OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to raise an important procedural question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Washington whether he intends to speak for more than 3 minutes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not believe that I shall take more than 3 minutes.

Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, or the week before last, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] submitted an amendment to the farm bill. The amendment was proposed as a substitute for the Mondale amendment, concerning the establishment of a Select Joint Committee To Study East-West Trade.

When the Senator from Connecticut submitted the amendment, he suggested that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I shall not take 3 minutes to go into the details concerning the jurisdiction of East-West trade. I am the chairman of a committee dealing with interstate and foreign commerce. It is so designated. I should like to underline foreign commerce.

We call it the Committee on Commerce in order to eliminate some verbiage. However, we not only have authority in this area, but we also have a direct mandate from the Senate to examine matters dealing with foreign commerce.

We have assumed and undertaken this responsibility on many occasions. We have studied foreign commerce with reference to its fiscal aspect and other aspects for many months.

As the Senator from Ohio, who is a distinguished member of the committee, can testify, we have been doing this for many years. However, for some reason, the Committee on Foreign Relations appears to believe this subject is within its jurisdiction. If a measure relates to commerce and is involved with the political situation to such an extent that the measure cannot survive, the committee believes the measure should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe they have sufficient problems with their foreign affairs. From what I read in the papers perhaps they have too many problems, certainly enough so they should not try to usurp the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce.

I told the Senator from Connecticut that it would do no good to request that the measure be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I informed him that our committee has deeply considered the problem for quite some time and that we hope to accomplish what the Senator suggested. The committee was unanimous in the view. I suggested that a bill providing for a select committee—even though I do not believe one is

23542

needed because our committee is working on the matter—should be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

I understood at that time that the Senator agreed with me, although I have not spoken to him recently. I told the Senator that the committee would prepare a letter, and the committee has prepared a letter. In the meantime, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] on September 14 resubmitted this measure, not as a substitute for the Mondale amendment, but as a separate resolution.

The Senator then requested that the measure be referred first to the Committee on Foreign Relations and then to the Committee on Commerce for consideration. I do not know what that means. However, I did think we had an understanding. There may be some misunderstanding between us. However, I did go to the desk prior to the 14th and stated that I wanted a hold placed on the referral on behalf of the Committee on Commerce.

Of course, the desk cannot be responsible when a Senator makes a unanimous-consent request and the request is not objected to.

As a result, we have a measure requesting the creation of a Joint Committee on East-West Trade referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations while our committee is in the midst of studying the problem. Subsequently the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] submitted a resolution and asked that a certain committee report on East-West trade—prepared by our committee—and the President has appointed a temporary group—I shall place the names in the RECORD—be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations because they were studying the wheat problem. The East-West trade problem is much broader than that.

I do not want to suggest that the Senator from Connecticut did not do what he thought we had suggested. Perhaps he did, and I shall talk with him. However, in the meantime, I serve notice that tomorrow I shall ask unanimous consent that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Commerce, regardless of whether the Senator from Connecticut is here. Nobody notified the Committee on Commerce when this happened—we were discussing the matter in the committee at that time.

If a unanimous consent request is not agreed to, I shall serve notice that we shall make a motion to put this measure back where it belongs—in the Committee on Commerce—and the Committee on Foreign Relations can take care of its own matters. They have plenty of matters to consider. However, I believe our committee is competent in this field, having spent day after day, week after week, and year after year in studying the matter of business and travel in foreign countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, is it permissible now to move to rerefer the measure to the Committee on Commerce?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may introduce a resolution to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of the matter which has been referred to it. The Senator may introduce such a resolution. If objection is heard, the matter will go over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a Senator on this side of the aisle, I have been asked to object to any unanimous-consent request that would interfere with the pending business. This being the morning hour, I most respectfully object. I have no objection to what the Senator wants to do, but I do object to it being done at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I serve notice that tomorrow, unless this matter is straightened out, I shall, as chairman of the committee—and directed by the committee—so move.

CONCERN OVER ATTEMPTS TO CREATE AND EXPLOIT A SEEMING DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND FORMER PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am seriously concerned that attempts to create and exploit a seeming disagreement between our President and former President Eisenhower may damage or obscure this Nation's commitment in Vietnam.

Deep and bitter partisanship has no place in the debate concerning so serious a matter as the situation facing us and the free world in South Vietnam. I deplore, therefore, a recent partisan attempt to build up a controversy between these two distinguished Americans for political purposes.

The details surrounding the origin of our commitment in Vietnam may not be precisely remembered; they may be open to some debate. But let us speak frankly and let us speak clearly: there must and can be no debate about the fact that that commitment now exists.

I believe that we must honor it. I believe that this Nation must stand courageously for freedom in South Vietnam or fall abjectly somewhere else in the future.

This is a time for unity, for mutual respect, and for serious discussion of our objectives in this effort—not for petty squabbling.

Fortunately, General Eisenhower has reaffirmed his strong support for President Johnson's policy in Vietnam. There the matter stands—and there it should be left to stand without irrelevant and mischievous debate.

I was deeply impressed by an article in the New York Journal-American of Sunday, August 22, by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., entitled, "Ike Settles It."

Mr. President, this article was written last month, but the controversy and discussion seems to continue. I believe it is well that it be printed in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent analysis be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR'S REPORT: IKE SETTLES IT
(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

It has seemed to me from the beginning that the attempts to build up a disagreement between President Johnson and former President Eisenhower over Vietnam were surpassingly silly and potentially destructive. Now, thank goodness, Ike has blasted those efforts to smithereens in two terse words—"All rot."

He spoke not only as the commanding voice of moderate republicanism, but as a patriotic American who, in times of national emergency or crisis, rises about partisan considerations and party lines.

Here is the heart of the matter, as General Eisenhower expressed it:

"When our country is in a position of crisis, there is only one thing a good American can do, and that is support the President."

For those who have been seeking to foment dissension over something that happened 11 years ago it might be well to remember, as they apparently had forgotten, that politics stop at the water's edge.

The disagreement buildup, in which sectors of our press and broadcasting industry as well as some Republicans showed more zeal than reason, began last Tuesday after General Eisenhower held a news conference in Washington.

At that time he voiced a mild demurrer over the emphasis that has been placed by the Johnson administration on a letter that Ike wrote in October 1954, to Ngo Dinh Diem, then Premier of South Vietnam. The administration has used the letter to demonstrate that U.S. commitment to South Vietnam began then.

Whether it did or did not depends largely on where you sit. It is quite true, as General Eisenhower pointed out, that "what we were talking about was economic and foreign aid"—not military aid or the commitment of our forces.

Yet General Eisenhower, disturbed by the reckless way in which his words have been slanted, has been among the first to make clear that what was policy in 1954 does not apply to policy in 1965.

In a statement Thursday at his Gettysburg farm he said the public should understand "how different the circumstances are today from a decade ago."

In 1954, he went on, there was hope that South Vietnam would be left in peace by the Communists in North Vietnam, and could survive as a free nation by economic aid alone. Those hopes, he said, have not been realized.

"I have said again and again that I support the President," Ike said. "I've done everything I can to show that I'm behind him."

His stand was endorsed by former Vice President Nixon and other Republican leaders attending the Gettysburg conference. It is endorsed, I am absolutely sure, by the vast majority of the American people, excluding the appeasers and let's-get-out-of-Vietnam clique.

It is distressing that a few Republicans, notably Representative GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, House GOP leader, have sought to make political capital out of a manufactured dissension that does not exist.

In view of General Eisenhower's Gettysburg remarks, where does this leave Mr. Ford?

I would say way out in right field.

Being good soldiers, U.S. astronauts of course never comment on matters outside their orbits, but it occurs to me that it would